BERGGREN

JYVÄSKYLÄ

27 April 2005

Patent- och registreringsverket
Valhallavägen 136
P.O. Box 5055
S-102 42 STOCKHOLM
Sweden

Authorized Officer: Roland Landström
Our ref: BP109193/TN/SPO

REPLY TO WRITTEN OPINION
INTERNATIONAL PATENT APPLICATION PCT/FI2004/050104
APPLICANT: NOKIA CORPORATION
DUE DATE: 27 April 2005

As a response to the Written Opinion provided together with the ISR the applicant would like to make the following remarks.

It is possible that not all features of the pending independent claims have been fully taken into account in formulating the opinion of the examining authority. The applicant would especially want to point out the feature according to which the blocking key is **executable**, i.e. has the appearance of a passage of program code or a series of executable instructions, which the device in question may execute in order to achieve the desired state in which the appropriate functions have been blocked or disabled. Additionally the pending independent claims explicitly require the blocking key to be received **wirelessly** in the device.

Document D1 does not speak about executable blocking keys. It discloses transmitting commands, so that it remains on the responsibility of the receiving device to recognize a command, to locate a corresponding piece of previously stored program code from its program memory and to arrange its execution.

Document D2 does not disclose executable blocking keys either. Additionally it should be noted that the disclosure of D2 is strictly limited to turning off the receiving device, which is not the same as blocking functions according to the present invention. A device in which functions have been blocked

according to the invention can always be made to unlock said functions by transmitting to it an unblocking code, while a device that was switched off according to D2 needs to be manually switched on before it can perform any other actions.

Document D3 again only describes the use of command-type transmissions, which means that the actual executable instructions for performing any function blocking must be already present in the receiving device.

Document D4 requires always the presence of a "contact device reader", which means that it cannot disclose anything about wirelessly transmitting executable blocking codes.

In document D5 mobile devices locating in certain area are constantly controlled. The controlling device and controlled device are in interactive connection and a prohibition is accomplished for certain period of time. Thus the prohibition is accomplished for a certain period of time and via conversational, interactive connection. No transmitting executable blocking code is presented.

In document D6 devices are, again, controlled in certain area, in which some functions are prohibited. No transmitting executable blocking code is presented.

Document D7 discloses a gate, which performs blocking/unblocking of functions for devices going through the gate. No transmitting executable blocking code is presented.

In document D8 user of a device controls enabling and disabling of the device. No external party is involved, neither is transmitting executable blocking code presented.

In document D9 a mobile phone is kept in a stand by –state, when a phone is in a certain area. No transmitting executable blocking code is presented.

The same shortcomings are repeated in various forms in reference publications D1–D9. It appears to be characteristic to prior art solutions that the transmitted commands are not executable as such but require the receiving device to locate and execute a separate piece of executable program code, which must have been stored in the program memory of the device in question earlier. Thus these publications can neither alone nor in any combinations constitute any bars to the patentability of the present invention, which requires the blocking code to be executable as such.

The discrepancy relating claims has been eliminated by filing amendments under Article 19 on 28 December 2004. Despite the said amendments, the applicant reactivates old claim 10 on the grounds of the following. The applicant notes that the cable connection recited therein may be an addition

to a device that otherwise comprises the wireless receiver means mentioned in claim 6. Therefore the applicant suggests leaving claim 10 in the application as it is.

In view of the foregoing the applicant respectfully requests the international examination to be based on the claims appended herewith, and asks for positive consideration of the merits of the application in its amended form.

BERGGREN OY AB
For Matti Brax

Arto Stenroos
Patent Attorney

ENCL   Amended claims

Claims

1.   A method for temporarily blocking a function in a portable device, **characterized** in that in the device there is received via a wireless connection an executable blocking key (201) for blocking a certain function of the device, and
5   that the received blocking key is activated (204) by programmable means in the device in order to prevent the certain function of the device.

2.   A method according to claim 1, **characterized** in that in the device there is received an unblocking key (206) that cancels the blocking key, and that the received unblocking key is activated (209) in the device in order to release the
10   function of the device that was blocked.

3.   A method according to any of the claims 1–2, **characterized** in that the blocking or unblocking key is received in the device through a wireless, short-range connection (104, 304), or in message form (110).

4.   A method according to any of the claims 1–3, **characterized** in that in the
15   device, there is displayed a confirmation request (202, 207), and that the received blocking or unblocking key is activated (204, 209) in the device as a response to feeding in the confirmation.

5.   A method according to any of the claims 1–4, **characterized** in that the blocking key is used for temporarily blocking (205) a certain undesirable function
20   of the device for the duration, until there is received an unblocking key (206), and by activating (209) said unblocking key (206) the blocked function is released (210) to function in the way it functioned before the activation of the blocking key.

6.   A portable device containing segments for realizing the device functions, **characterized** in that the device includes means for receiving via a wireless
25   connection an executable blocking key for blocking a certain function (103, 104, 110, 303, 304), and programmable means for activating (306) the received blocking key in the device in order to prevent the function of a certain segment thereof.

7.   A portable device according to claim 6, **characterized** in that it includes
30   means for receiving (103, 104, 110, 303, 304) an unblocking key for releasing the function blocked by the blocking key, and means for activating (306) the received unblocking key in the device in order to release the function that was prevented by the blocking key.

8.   A portable device according to any of the claims 6–7, **characterized** in that it includes means for receiving a blocking key and/or an unblocking key transmitted along a wireless, short-range connection (104, 304).

9.   A portable device according to any of the claims 6–8, **characterized** in that it includes means for receiving blocking key and/or an unblocking key of a a message-form transmitted through a message service center (110).

10.   A portable device according to any of the claims 6–9, **characterized** in that it includes means for receiving a blocking key and/or an unblocking key via a stationary cable connection (103, 303).

11.   A portable device according to any of the claims 6–9, **characterized** in that it includes means for displaying a confirmation request (120, 320) and for feeding in a confirmation (102, 302) before the received blocking or unblocking key is activated in the device.

12.   A portable device according to any of the claims 6–10, **characterized** in that it includes program means (306) for processing the blocking and unblocking keys.